



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

many well-meaning people believe it to be the business of the school to teach *omnia quae sciri possunt*. Knowledge, it is true, is the material with which the schools must work. Without it there could be no schools. But the duty of the school is far less to instill into the brain a certain quantity of knowledge than to teach the pupil how to learn, to beget in the child the joy of learning. It is claimed that grammatical instruction must give way to more practical studies. Now, we live in the age of applied science. We might even write a history of human civilization based upon the history of the development of technical instruments. And yet, there are those who speak with scorn of the study of language, which, after all, is the greatest tool which the human mind has made for its own use, and they believe they understand the use of this tool, if they are able to converse in a language. They heap ridicule upon the fact that those who learn Latin cannot speak it, while any clerk who wishes to go abroad 'masters' a foreign language in three months. But they forget that to speak a language is not a knowledge at all; it is an acquired ability, like tobogganing, swimming and such. The chief value of teaching Latin is to train the youth in clear-cut logical distinctions. Any translation into Latin compels the pupil to perform logical operations. If grammar has to go, Latin might go as well. For the mere reading of the literature, valuable as it is, does not justify the study of Latin, and, moreover, it has no value whatever without a knowledge of Greek.

Lastly, it is said that students never again open a Latin book. Even if that were true, it would prove nothing. There is a beautiful paradox, that culture is the sum total of what a man has forgotten. But behind the paradox is a great truth: one becomes cultured by training one's mind in such a way that on every occasion one is able to take notice not of the accidental but of causation and consequence. It is immaterial whether a rule is forgotten. The important thing is this, that the learning, and the practice of such a rule have graven certain grooves in our brains. Are not mathematical proofs as quickly forgotten as Greek aorists? . . . It is true that life is practical and that the first question is how to provide for one's sustenance. That is our contention, and we always state it, when people ridicule Socialism by saying, 'you socialists are interested only in the concrete, in what touches your stomach'. Hungry people, people who know not where to lay their heads, can not be idealists. But let them not forget that far above anything practical there is another world, the world of immaterial possessions, and that these are not the achievements of applied science,—these are only means to an end; far above these is art, and we still say with the poet, Who does not listen to the voice of poetry, is a barbarian, be he who he may.

ERNST RIESS.

CORRESPONDENCE

My attention has been called to an article on my letter to the Harvard Alumni Bulletin in October, signed by "G. L." (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6.121). If Professor Lodge will read my letter over again, he will see that he has misunderstood its purpose. I did not write that letter in order to make a case for the "paramount importance" of archaeology, nor of the approach to classical studies through the medium of archaeology, but to defend archaeology against an ill-deserved attack. I would be the last person in the world to maintain that through the study of archaeology alone the Greek atmosphere is to be gained: on the contrary, I believe that, as I said in my letter, archaeology is a great, though not indispensable help to the proper appreciation of Greek life and thought. To the serious student of archaeology, an intimate and appreciative knowledge of the classical languages is indispensable; and the "Grecians" of whom G. L. so learnedly speaks are not serious archaeologists but dilettanti. In fact, they can be nothing else, without a thorough knowledge of Greek and Latin. In my opinion, the knowledge and appreciation of the beauty of Greek literature is the primary thing, but, if it can be attained, as I think it can, through the secondary help of archaeology, let us not slight it, but use it as a means to an end.

In justice to myself, and that my opinion may be no longer misrepresented, I shall esteem it as a favor if you will give this communication the same publicity that you gave G. L.'s article.

STEPHEN B. LUCE, JR.

[Perhaps Mr. Luce does not regard archaeology as of "paramount" importance. If he objects to that word I will gladly substitute another. As for the rest the quotations from Mr. Luce's own article seem to me sufficient to justify my conclusions. G. L.]

The views expressed in the editorial of February 15 seem to me to call for vigorous protest. In the first place, may I ask, is it *reasonable*—I will not say *politic*,—in this twentieth century, for any paper that is supposed to be upholding the best interests of the Classics, in any way to stimulate antagonism between classical literature and classical archaeology? May we not reasonably continue to regard the two as mutually helpful? As to which of the two is the more important, why spend time to debate? Two good friends cannot be forever considering in their hearts which is the bigger man. Else they are no friends.

And is it quite axiomatic, as you imply, that the study of ancient cisterns adds nothing to one's appreciation of the Greek genius? Does the lover of Aristophanes get nothing from the study of that complex of rock cuttings—cisterns, drains, steps, walls—in the bare hills beyond the Pnyx? For my part, I believe Greek stock rose on my private 'Change a good fifty percent the day I saw the sewerage system of the Palace at Cnossus. Nor has it ever declined since.

Again, need we so despise those who approach Greek by some other way than that which is orthodox? (*Orthodoxy*, of course, = ἡ δόξα ἡμῶν). For instance, I know a man who, at forty, has been "lured to the study of Greek by the interest which he has found in the remains of Greek art", and who as a result of that lure is now beginning to enjoy the Odyssey in the original. I know another, one of the most brilliant students I ever had, who was first

lured to Greek by what you would label, I suppose, the barbarous "neargold" of a poetical translation of Homer. The straight and narrow path is not the figure for us Hellenists to apply to our subject. Rather let us recognize that in the world of intellect and spirit, as Emerson somewhere points out, *all* roads lead to Greece! This is not the century for men either to advocate, or to illustrate in their own persons, as one of the advantages gained by the study of Greek, that which Benson's Ancient Dean of Christ Church points to—"a proper contempt for those who <are> ignorant of it".

Nor can any lover of Greek, I think, readily grant that a man who "is interested in art or archaeology" "will probably find as much enjoyment in Mexican primitive life as he does in that of Classical Africa". Any more than he could grant that one interested in literature would probably find as much enjoyment in Choctaw as in the Greek of Pericles's time. Unless, to be sure, all that is gotten from the study of Greek literature, as your editorial seems sadly to assume to be often the case, is "infinite labor" and dim comprehension of "the Greek itself".

And, in fine, I believe it is high time that we stopped putting on supercilious airs and retorting 'Philistine'! when we are charged with being 'impractical'. In so far as the attack is based—and it often is—on a sane definition of the practical, it is absolutely reasonable. The age is putting even religion to the same test, and those forms of religion that fail to meet the test are dying or dead. Needless to say, education, which is less nearly sacrosanct, cannot avoid being tried by the same standard. Nevertheless it does not follow, I believe, that to our age *practical* means *material*. Rather it does mean *vital*, *related to the present age and ministering to it*, and that is what Greek must be to our age as it has been to many past ages.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE.

WM. W. BAKER.

[If Professor Baker will reread the editorial which he criticises he will observe that the value of the study of archaeology is admitted as an ancillary study to Greek. The trouble with many scholars is that they make Greek ancillary to archaeology. Also the few valuable students, whether 40 or 20 years of age, who do get over the wall are recognized in my remarks. G. L.]

In *The Nation* for February 27 (pages 203-205) there was a review of a book by Mr. A. Fingland Jack, entitled *An Introduction to the History of Life Assurance*. Part of the review is worth quoting here:

As a matter of fact, death dues are of long standing. Prominent among the divergent purposes of the Roman Collegia was that of providing fitting burial for the members. Under the Empire this was the all-important consideration with the Collegia Tenuiorum, associations of people of the lower classes, including even slaves. Apparently, an unfettered right of association prevailed in the days of the Republic, but under the Emperors restrictive measures are discerned. Both Caesar and Augustus suppressed those colleges which they regarded as dangerous, and it was decreed that new associations should be formed only by special permission. This was part of a clear-sighted policy. The Emperors distrusted the upper and middle classes, and for this reason deprived them of the right to combine. Their reliance was upon the army and the lower classes, and they therefore tolerated the Collegia Tenuiorum; indeed, they went out of their way to encourage such associations.

There exists an inscription of the year 136 A.D. which furnishes some interesting information regarding one of the Collegia—the Collegium Cultorum Dianae et Antinoi, at Lanuvium—and which doubtless may be taken as typical. New members had to pay an entrance fee of 100 sesterii (about 14s. 7d.), and to provide an amphora of "good wine", and thereafter contribute to the funds 5 asses (about 2 3-16d.) monthly. The capital thus created constituted the provision for the burial of members. On the death of a member, a sum of 300 sesterii was paid out to meet the expenses, 50 sesterii of this amount being distributed among the funeral train.

It is easy to trace a certain resemblance between such associations as this and the modern life insurance company. Methods somewhat analogous to life insurance of to-day existed also in connection with the Roman army. The Emperors, for obvious reasons, were liberal in their largess to the legionaries, and the recipients were bound to deposit with the ensigns half of what befell them on each occasion, the sum being put to their credit and repaid only at the end of their service, save perhaps in exceptional cases. It remains a disputed question how far the Roman colleges may be regarded as societies aiming at mutual assistance. Yet, as Mr. Jack observes, they had only a step to take to become so. But was the step taken? Mommsen supposed that the collegia Tenuiorum, in addition to the care of burials, devoted themselves to aims of reciprocal support. Others have followed him in this view. The evidence, however, is not yet sufficient to support the theory.

Also, that there is any direct line of development between the Roman colleges and the guilds of a later period has still to be proved. . . . While it may be impossible to trace the craft guild back to the Roman Collegia in a continuous line, it is not improbable that some of the artisan corporations in Gaul had a continuous existence from the fifth to the twelfth century, and even that the organizations of servile craftsmen on the lands of the larger manors and monasteries had been consciously constituted on the model of the Roman colleges.

ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS¹

The Athenaeum (London)—Jan. 11, (Greek Literature—Lectures at Columbia University: Roman Laws and Charters, Translated by E. G. Hardy; Catalogue of the Ancient Sculptures Preserved in the Municipal Collections of Rome—The Sculptures of the Museo Capitolino, by Members of the British School in Rome); Jan. 18, (E. Maunde Thompson, An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography); Jan. 25, (J. C. Stobart, The Grandeur that was Rome); The Ancient Mysteries and their Relation to St. Paul, W. M. Ramsay; Feb. 1, (Loeb Classical Library).

Harvard Theological Review—Jan., The Relation of Plato to our Age and to the Ages, G. R. Dodson.

English Historical Review—Jan., Ancient Rome and Ireland, Professor Haverfield.

Fortnightly Review—Feb., Greek Drama and the Dance, G. Warre Cornish.

The Nation (London)—Feb., (Gilbert Murray, Four Stages of Greek Religion).

The Nation (New York)—Feb. 20, (T. R. Glover, Virgil).

Science—Feb. 21, The Study of Man, George Trumbull Ladd (bears on Protagoras).

Spectator (London)—Jan. 18, (Loeb Classical Lib.); Jan. 25, (English Literature and the Classics); Feb. 1, Mediaeval Latin.

Times (London, Literary Supplement)—Jan. 10, The Schoolmaster of Europe (Varro on Farming, Translated by L. Storr-Best).

Yale Review—Jan., The "Tradition" of Greek Literature, Gilbert Murray.

¹ For the significance of the forms adopted in making the entries see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 6.39. Valuable assistance has been rendered by Professor H. H. Yeames and Mr. Irving Demarest.